

# INTEGRAL REPRESENTATION OF FUNCTIONS ON THE CIRCLE

GIULIANO BASSO

ABSTRACT. We give a complete characterization of all real-valued functions on the unit circle  $S^1$  that can be represented by integrating the spherical distance on  $S^1$  with respect to a signed measure or a probability measure.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Given a bounded complete metric space  $(X, d)$ , we let  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  denote the set of all Borel probability measures on  $X$ . For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  we say that  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X)$  is a *coupling* of  $(\mu, \nu)$  if  $\pi(A \times X) = \mu(A)$  and  $\pi(X \times A) = \nu(A)$  for all Borel subsets  $A \subset X$ . The following expression

$$W_1(\mu, \nu) = \inf \int_{X \times X} d(x, y) \, d\pi(x, y),$$

where the infimum is taken over all couplings  $\pi$  of  $(\mu, \nu)$ , defines a metric on  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . We refer to this metric as the 1-Wasserstein distance. Wasserstein distances on general metric spaces are an important object of study in optimal transport theory. In the present article, we will focus on the special case when  $X$  is the unit circle  $S^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  equipped with the spherical distance  $d_{S^1}$ . Recall that the spherical distance  $d_{S^n}$  on the unit sphere  $S^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  is defined by

$$d_{S^n}(x, y) = \arccos(\langle x, y \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}).$$

In particular, for distinct points  $x, y \in S^1$ , we find that  $d_{S^1}(x, y)$  is equal to the length of the shorter arc of  $S^1 \setminus \{x, y\}$ .

The canonical embedding  $\delta: S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S^1)$  defined by  $x \mapsto \delta_x$  is an isometric embedding (meaning that  $W_1(\delta(x), \delta(y)) = d_{S^1}(x, y)$  for all  $x, y \in S^1$ ). This follows directly from the general observation that the product measure  $\delta_x \otimes \delta_y$  is the only coupling of  $(\delta_x, \delta_y)$ . In general, it seems difficult to predict which metric spaces besides  $S^1$  also admit an isometric embedding into  $\mathcal{P}(S^1)$ . To the author's knowledge the only known result in this direction is the following quite remarkable theorem by Creutz [Cre20].

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 45B05, Secondary 26A42, 58C05.

*Key words and phrases*. Integral representation, functions on the circle, total variation, Stieltjes measure, Wasserstein 1-distance.

**Theorem 1.1** (Creutz embedding theorem). *The canonical embedding  $\delta: S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S^1)$  can be extended to an isometric embedding of the closed upper hemisphere  $H^+ \subset S^2$  into  $\mathcal{P}(S^1)$ .*

Such an isometric extension  $\Phi: H^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S^1)$  can be constructed explicitly. For  $p \in H^+ \setminus S^1$ , the measures  $\Phi(p)$  can be taken to be absolutely continuous with respect to the normalized Hausdorff 1-measure  $\mathcal{H}^1$  on  $S^1$ . Let  $f_p: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by  $f_p(x) = d_{S^2}(p, x)$  for  $p \in H^+ \setminus S^1$ . Creutz showed that there exists a density  $\varrho_p$  on  $S^1$  depending only on  $f_p''$  such that

$$\Phi(p) = \varrho_p \mathcal{H}^1$$

is a probability measure for which

$$(1.1) \quad f_p(x) = \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(x, y) \Phi(p)(dy)$$

for all  $x \in S^1$ . Notice that the right hand side of (1.1) is nothing but  $W_1(\Phi(p), \delta_x)$ . Hence, in particular  $d_{S^2}(p, x) = W_1(\Phi(p), \delta_x)$ . Using an analytic expression for the 1-Wasserstein distance on  $S^1$  by Cabrelli and Molter [CM95], Creutz moreover showed that

$$W_1(\Phi(p), \Phi(q)) = \|f_p - f_q\|_\infty$$

for all  $p, q \in H^+ \setminus S^1$ . Since any two points  $p, q \in H^+ \setminus S^1$  lie on a great circle which intersects  $S^1$ , it is now easy to check that  $\|f_p - f_q\|_\infty = d_{S^2}(p, q)$ . Hence,  $\Phi$  is an isometric embedding.

In this article, we are interested in the natural question which other functions  $f: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  admit an integral representation as in (1.1). To answer this question it turns out to be beneficial to work within the more general framework of signed measures.

**Definition 1.2.** A function  $f: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *representable by a signed measure* if there exists a signed Borel measure  $\lambda$  on  $S^1$  such that

$$(1.2) \quad f(x) = \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(x, y) \lambda(dy).$$

for all  $x \in S^1$ .

Different measures may represent the same function. For example, if  $\lambda$  satisfies  $\lambda(S^1) = 1$  and  $\lambda(A) = \lambda(-A)$  for all Borel subsets  $A \subset S^1$ , then we have

$$\int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(x, y) \lambda(dy) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{S^1} [d_{S^1}(x, y) + d_{S^1}(x, -y)] \lambda(dy) = \frac{\pi}{2}$$

and so any such  $\lambda$  induces the constant function  $f \equiv \frac{\pi}{2}$ . Let  $T: S^1 \rightarrow S^1$  denote the antipodal map  $T(x) = -x$ . Clearly, every signed measure  $\lambda$  admits a decomposition

$$\lambda = \lambda^a + \lambda^s$$

with  $T_{\#}\lambda^a = -\lambda^a$  and  $T_{\#}\lambda^s = \lambda^s$ . Here, we use  $T_{\#}\lambda$  to denote the push-forward of  $\lambda$  under  $T$ . Let  $f_{\lambda}$  denote the right-hand side of (1.2). By the above, it follows that

$$(1.3) \quad f_{\lambda} = f_{\lambda^a} + (\pi/2) \cdot \lambda(S^1).$$

Hence, only the anti-symmetric part of  $\lambda$  induces non-trivial integral representations. Our first result shows that the assignment  $\lambda \mapsto f_{\lambda}$  is injective when restricted to anti-symmetric measures.

**Lemma 1.3.** *If  $f: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is induced by  $\lambda$  and  $\eta$ , then  $\lambda^a = \eta^a$ . In other words, whenever  $f$  is induced by  $\lambda$  then the anti-symmetric part  $\lambda^a$  of  $\lambda$  is unique.*

We now proceed by setting the stage for our main result, Theorem 1.4, which provides an equivalent condition for a function  $f$  on  $S^1$  to be representable by a signed measure.

Let  $q: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S^1$  be the covering map defined by  $q(t) = (\cos(t), \sin(t))$ . This induces a natural left action of  $\mathbb{R}$  on  $S^1$  by setting  $x +_q t = q(a+t)$ , for any  $a \in q^{-1}(x)$ . We say that  $f: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *left-differentiable* (with respect to  $q$ ) if the limit

$$\partial_- f(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{f(x +_q t) - f(x)}{t}$$

exists for each  $x \in S^1$ . For example, for every  $p \in S^1$  the function  $d_p(x) = d_{S^1}(p, x)$  is left-differentiable. The *total variation* of a function  $f$  on  $S^1$  is defined by

$$\|f\|_{\text{TV}(S^1)} = \sup \sum_{i=0}^n |f(x_i) - f(x_{i+1})|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all partitions  $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$  of  $S^1$ . To be precise,  $P$  is called a partition of  $S^1$  if there exists a partition  $t_0 \leq \dots \leq t_{n+1}$  of  $[0, 2\pi] \subset \mathbb{R}$  such that  $x_i = q(t_i)$ .

Our main theorem states that the above definitions already suffice to fully characterize those functions on the circle that are representable by a signed measure.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $f: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function and  $C \in \mathbb{R}$  a real number. Consider the following two conditions:*

(A) *the sum of images of antipodal points equals  $\pi \cdot C$ , that is,*

$$f(x) + f(-x) = \pi \cdot C$$

*for all  $x \in S^1$ .*

(B)  *$f$  is Lipschitz continuous and left-differentiable such that the total variation of  $\partial_- f$  is finite.*

*Then, assuming (A) and (B) is equivalent to the existence of a unique signed measure  $\lambda$  on  $S^1$  with  $T_{\#}\lambda = -\lambda$  such that  $f$  is representable by  $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda + C \cdot \mathcal{H}^1$ .*

The measure  $\lambda$  will be a multiple of the Stieltjes measure associated to  $\partial_- f$ . We emphasize that it is not clear *a priori* whether  $\partial_- f$  is left continuous or not. Therefore, an important part of the proof will be devoted to deriving this property for  $\partial_- f$ .

There are many examples of functions satisfying the conditions of the theorem. For instance, a natural class of functions satisfying condition (A) are elements of the injective hull  $E(S^1)$  of  $S^1$ . A metric space  $Y$  is called *injective* if every 1-Lipschitz map  $f: A \rightarrow Y$  from any subset  $A$  of a metric space  $X$  can be extended to a 1-Lipschitz map  $F: X \rightarrow Y$ . Basic examples of injective metric spaces include the real line, the Banach spaces  $\ell_\infty^n$  and complete metric  $\mathbb{R}$ -trees. A deep result of Isbell [Isb64] from the 1960s shows that every metric space  $X$  has an (essentially) unique injective hull  $E(X)$ . This injective metric space can be characterized as the smallest injective space containing  $X$  isometrically. In [GM00], it is shown that

$$E(S^1) = \{f: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : f \text{ is 1-Lipschitz and } f(x) + f(-x) = \pi\}$$

equipped with the supremum norm. See also [LMW<sup>+</sup>21]. Hence, functions  $f \in E(S^1)$  satisfy condition (A) and thus  $f \in E(S^1)$  is representable by a signed measure if and only if it satisfies condition (B) of Theorem 1.4.

We now deal with finite Borel measures  $\mu: \mathcal{B}(S^1) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  on  $S^1$ . One might ask whether every function that is representable by a signed measure is also representable by such a measure. However, this is not possible in general (see Example 2.2 below). By closely inspecting the proof of Theorem 1.4, we get the following characterization of functions on  $S^1$  that are representable by a non-negative measure.

**Corollary 1.5.** *Let  $f: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function and  $C \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  a non-negative real number. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  *$f$  is representable by a Borel measure with total mass  $C$ .*
- (ii)  *$f$  satisfies (A) and (B) of Theorem 1.4 and  $\|\partial_- f\|_{\text{TV}(S^1)} \leq 4C$ .*

Moreover, if  $f$  is representable by a measure with total mass  $C$ , then there exists a unique Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $S^1$  with  $\mu(S^1) = \frac{1}{4}\|\partial_- f\|_{\text{TV}(S^1)}$  such that

$$\bar{\mu} = \mu + \left[C - \frac{1}{4} \cdot \|\partial_- f\|_{\text{TV}(S^1)}\right] \cdot \mathcal{H}^1$$

is a non-negative measure and  $f$  is representable by  $\bar{\mu}$ .

The appearance of the factor 4 in (ii) may seem surprising at first sight. It can be interpreted as follows. For  $p \in S^1$  let  $d_p: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by  $d_p(x) = d_{S^1}(p, x)$ . Then  $d_p \circ q$  is a translate of the 'zigzag' function  $z: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is the unique  $2\pi$ -periodic function such that  $z(t) = |t|$  on  $[-\pi, \pi)$ . Thus, the left derivative of  $d_p \circ q$  alternates periodically between the values  $-1$  and  $1$ , and its restriction to  $[-\pi, \pi)$  has exactly two break points. In particular, we find that the total variation of  $\partial_- d_p$  is equal to 4. Clearly,  $d_p$  is representable by a probability measure (take  $\mu = \delta_p$ ). Now,

Corollary 1.5 tells us that for  $f$  to be representable by a probability measure it is necessary that the total variation of  $\partial_- f$  is no greater than the total variation of  $\partial_- d_p$ .

## 2. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

Let  $X = (X, d)$  denote a metric space and  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. A function  $\lambda: \mathcal{B}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called a *signed measure* if  $\lambda(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $\lambda$  is countably additive, that is,

$$\lambda(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(A_i)$$

for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  and all countable Borel partitions  $(A_i)$  of  $A$ . The proof of Theorem 1.4 makes heavy use of the following well-known consequence of Fubini's theorem.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $T \geq 0$  be a real number and  $g: S^1 \rightarrow [-T, T]$  a Borel measurable function. Further, let  $\phi: [-T, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be absolutely continuous. If  $\lambda$  is a signed measure on  $S^1$ , then*

$$(2.1) \quad \int_{S^1} \phi(g(x)) \lambda(dx) = \phi(T) \lambda(S^1) - \int_{-T}^T \phi'(t) \lambda(\{x \in S^1 : g(x) < t\}) dt.$$

*Proof.* Omitted. □

Recall that  $|\lambda|: \mathcal{B}(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  defined by

$$B \mapsto \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda(B_i)| : (B_i)_{i=1}^n \text{ Borel partition of } B \right\}$$

is a Borel measure on  $X$ . It is called *the total variation of  $\lambda$* . Now, we are already in a position to prove Theorem 1.4.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* We begin by showing the reverse implication. Since by assumption  $T_{\#} \lambda = -\lambda$ , we get that  $\lambda(S^1) = 0$  and thus  $\bar{\lambda}(S^1) = C$ . Moreover, for all  $x \in S^1$  we compute

$$f_{\bar{\lambda}}(x) + f_{\bar{\lambda}}(T(x)) = \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(x, y) \bar{\lambda}(dy) + \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(T(x), y) \bar{\lambda}(dy) = \pi \cdot \bar{\lambda}(S^1).$$

This establishes (A). Next, we show (B). Since each function  $d_{S^1}(\cdot, y)$  is 1-Lipschitz, it is easy to check that  $f_{\bar{\lambda}}$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz for  $L = |\lambda|(S^1)$ . By virtue of Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem,  $f_{\bar{\lambda}}$  is left-differentiable. Indeed, we have

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_- f_{\bar{\lambda}}(x) &= \int_{S^1} \partial_-(d_{S^1}(\cdot, y))(x) \lambda(dy) \\ &= \lambda[T(x), x) - \lambda[x, T(x)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $[x, T(x)) = \{x +_q t : t \in [0, \pi)\}$ . Here, as in the introduction,  $q: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S^1$  is defined by  $q(t) = (\cos(t), \sin(t))$ . By the above, it follows that

$$\|\partial_- f_{\bar{\lambda}}\|_{\text{TV}(S^1)} \leq |\lambda|(S^1).$$

This establishes (B), as desired.

Conversely, suppose now that conditions (A) and (B) hold. Due to (B) we obtain that  $h := f \circ q$  is left-differentiable and the total variation of  $\partial_- h$  is finite on every bounded interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ . In particular, there exist bounded non-decreasing functions  $\alpha, \beta: [-\pi, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\partial_- h = \alpha - \beta$  on  $[-\pi, \pi]$ . Since  $h|_{[-\pi, \pi]}$  is Lipschitz, it follows that

$$h(t) - h(-\pi) = \int_{-\pi}^t \partial_- h(s) ds = \int_{-\pi}^t \alpha(s) ds - \int_{-\pi}^t \beta(s) ds.$$

Hence,  $h|_{[-\pi, \pi]}$  can be written as the difference of two convex functions. Since the left-derivative of a convex function is left-continuous (see e.g. [Roc70, Theorem 24.1]), this implies that  $\partial_- h$  is left-continuous.

We now consider the Stieltjes measure  $\lambda^* := d(\partial_- h)$  on  $[\pi, \pi)$ . It is well-known that this is the unique signed Borel measure on  $[-\pi, \pi)$  such that

$$(2.3) \quad \lambda^*[s, t) = \partial_- h(t) - \partial_- h(s)$$

for all  $s, t \in [-\pi, \pi)$  with  $s \leq t$ . We set  $\lambda = q_{\#} \lambda^*$ . Because of (A), we find that

$$(2.4) \quad \partial_- h(t) = -\partial_- h(t - \pi)$$

for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ; as a result,  $T_{\#} \lambda = -\lambda$ . Using Lemma 2.1, we get for each  $t \in [0, \pi)$  that

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{S^1} d(q(t), y) \lambda(dy) &= \pi \cdot \lambda(S^1) + \int_{t-\pi}^t \lambda^*[-\pi, s) ds \\ &\quad - \int_{-\pi}^{t-\pi} \lambda^*[-\pi, s) ds - \int_t^{\pi} \lambda^*[-\pi, s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

From (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5) it follows that

$$\int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(q(t), y) \lambda(dy) = 2 \int_{t-\pi}^t \partial_- h(s) ds = 4f(q(t)) - 2\pi C.$$

for all  $t \in [0, \pi)$ . Hence, by setting  $\bar{\lambda} = \frac{1}{4}\lambda + C \cdot \mathcal{H}^1$ , we find that

$$(2.6) \quad \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(q(t), y) \bar{\lambda}(dy) = f(q(t))$$

for all  $t \in [0, \pi)$ . Using condition (A) and  $\bar{\lambda}(S^1) = C$ , a short calculation now shows that (2.6) also holds for all  $t \in [-\pi, 0)$ . Hence,  $f = f_{\bar{\lambda}}$ , as desired.

To finish the proof we need to show that  $\lambda$  is unique. To this end, suppose  $\eta$  is a signed measure such that  $T_{\#}\eta = -\eta$  (or equivalently  $\eta^a = \eta$ ) and  $f$  is representable by  $\bar{\eta} = \eta + C \cdot \mathcal{H}^1$ . It follows from (2.2) that

$$\lambda[T(x), x) - \lambda[x, T(x)) = \eta[T(x), x) - \eta[x, T(x))$$

for all  $x \in S^1$ . Since  $\lambda(S^1) = \eta(S^1) = 0$ , we obtain that  $\lambda$  and  $\eta$  agree on all half-open intervals  $[x, T(x))$ . For all  $y \in [x, T(x))$ , we have

$$2 \cdot \lambda[x, y) = \lambda[x, T(x)) - \lambda[y, T(x)),$$

and therefore  $\lambda$  and  $\eta$  agree on all half-open intervals of length less than or equal to  $\pi$ . Since these intervals generate the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $S^1$ , a standard application of Dynkin's  $\pi$ - $\lambda$  theorem yields that  $\lambda = \eta$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 1.3.* Suppose that  $\lambda$  and  $\eta$  are signed measures such that  $f = f_{\lambda} = f_{\eta}$ . Since

$$f(x) + f(-x) = \int_{S^1} [d_{S^1}(x, y) + d_{S^1}(-x, y)] \lambda(dy) = \pi \cdot \lambda(S^1),$$

we find that  $\lambda(S^1) = \eta(S^1)$ . Now, (1.3) tells us that  $f_{\lambda} = f_{\lambda^a} + \frac{\pi}{2} \cdot \lambda(S^1)$  and thereby it follows that  $f_{\lambda^a} = f_{\eta^a}$ . Hence, because of Theorem 1.4 we have that  $\lambda^a = \eta^a$ , as was to be shown.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.5.* By a close inspection of the proof of Theorem 1.4 it is readily verified that (i)  $\implies$  (ii). Thus, it remains to show that (ii)  $\implies$  (i). To this end, suppose  $f$  satisfies all conditions of (ii). In particular,  $f$  satisfies conditions (A) and (B) of Theorem 1.4. Let  $\lambda$  denote the signed measure from Theorem 1.4. We set  $\mu := \frac{1}{2}\lambda^+$ , where  $\lambda = \lambda^+ - \lambda^-$  is the Jordan decomposition of  $\lambda$ . By construction,  $T_{\#}\lambda^+ = \lambda^-$  and thus  $\mu(S^1) = \frac{1}{4}|\lambda|(S^1) = \frac{1}{4}\|\partial_- f\|_{\text{TV}(S^1)}$ . Since for all  $x \in S^1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 2f_{\bar{\lambda}}(x) - \pi \cdot C &= \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(x, y) \mu(dy) - \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(x, T(y)) \mu(dy) \\ &= 2 \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(x, y) \mu(dy) - \pi \cdot \mu(S^1), \end{aligned}$$

it follows that  $f = f_{\bar{\mu}}$ , as was to be shown. To finish the proof we need to show that if  $\nu$  is a Borel measure on  $S^1$  with  $\nu(S^1) = \frac{1}{4}\|\partial_- f\|_{\text{TV}(S^1)}$  such that

$$\bar{\nu} = \nu + \left[ C - \frac{1}{4} \cdot \|\partial_- f\|_{\text{TV}(S^1)} \right] \cdot \mathcal{H}^1$$

satisfies  $f_{\bar{\nu}} = f_{\bar{\mu}}$ , then  $\nu = \mu$ . Clearly,  $\bar{\mu}^a = \mu^a$  and thus it follows from Theorem 1.4 that  $\mu^a = \nu^a$ . In particular, using that  $\mu(S^1) = \nu(S^1)$ , we find that  $\mu[x, T(x)) = \nu[x, T(x))$  for all  $x \in S^1$ . Now, exactly the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 1.4 shows that  $\mu = \nu$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

We finish this section with an example showing that not every function that is representable by a signed measure is also representable by a non-negative measure.

**Example 2.2.** We suppose in the following that the reader is familiar with basic notions from metric geometry. Good general references for this topic are [BBI01, BH99]. Let  $X$  be the metric space that is obtained by gluing  $S^1$  and a tripod with edges of length  $\frac{\pi}{3}$  along three equidistant points  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  of  $S^1$ . We equip  $X$  with its intrinsic metric  $d$ . Let  $o \in X$  denote the center of the tripod. The map  $d_o: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $x \mapsto d(x, o)$  satisfies conditions (A) and (B) of Theorem 1.4 with  $C = 1$ . Thus, Theorem 1.4 tells us that  $d_o$  is representable by a signed measure. Suppose now that there exists a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $S^1$  such that  $f_\mu = d_o$ . In the following, we show that this is not possible.

In [Cre20], Creutz showed that  $f_\mu = d_o$  implies that every 1-Lipschitz map from  $S^1$  to a Banach space extends to a 1-Lipschitz map on  $\{o\} \cup S^1 \subset X$ . However, there exist 1-Lipschitz maps  $\phi: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  that do not permit a 1-Lipschitz extension to  $\{o\} \cup S^1 \subset X$ . Indeed, let  $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be an equilateral triangle with perimeter  $2\pi$  and vertices  $v_1, v_2, v_3$  and let  $\phi: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  be the inverse map of the map  $\Delta \rightarrow S^1$  that is distance-preserving on the edges and sends  $v_i$  to  $x_i$ . Clearly,  $\phi$  is 1-Lipschitz. Suppose  $\Phi: \{o\} \cup S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is a 1-Lipschitz extension of  $\phi$ . Then

$$\Phi(o) \in \bigcap_{i=1}^3 B_{\frac{\pi}{3}}(v_i),$$

which is not possible. Hence, such a map cannot exist, which in turn implies that there is no probability measure  $\mu$  on  $S^1$  with  $f_\mu = d_o$ .

Let  $d_o$  denote the function from Example 2.2. We now give another (shorter) proof of why  $d_o$  cannot be represented by any measure. Since for all  $x \in S^1$ , we have that  $d_o(x) + d_o(T(x)) = \pi$ , it follows that if  $d_o$  were representable by a measure  $\mu$ , then  $\mu$  must necessarily be a probability measure. But a straightforward calculation reveals that

$$\|\partial_- d_o\|_{\text{TV}(S^1)} = 12 > 4;$$

hence, Corollary 1.5 implies that  $d_o$  is not representable by a probability measure. Thus, it is not representable by any measure.

## REFERENCES

- [BBI01] D. Burago, Yu. Burago, and S. Ivanov. *A course in metric geometry*, volume 33 of *Grad. Stud. Math.* Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2001.
- [BH99] M. R. Bridson and A. Haefliger. *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, volume 319 of *Grundlehren Math. Wiss.* Berlin: Springer, 1999.
- [CM95] C. A. Cabrelli and U. M. Molter. The Kantorovich metric for probability measures on the circle. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 57(3):345–361, 1995.



- [Cre20] P. Creutz. Majorization by hemispheres and quadratic isoperimetric constants. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 373(3):1577–1596, 2020.
- [GM00] O. Goodman and V. Moulton. On the tight span of an antipodal graph. *Discrete Math.*, 218(1-3):73–96, 2000.
- [Isb64] J. R. Isbell. Six theorems about injective metric spaces. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 39:65–76, 1964.
- [LMW<sup>+</sup>21] S. Lim, F. Memoli, Z. Wan, Q. Wang, and L. Zhou. Some results about the tight span of spheres. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.12646*, 2021.
- [Roc70] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*, volume No. 28 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.

MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, VIVATSGASSE 7, 53111 BONN, GERMANY

*Email address:* `giuliano.basso@web.de`